IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR

WEDNESDAY, THE 6TH JUNE 2007 / 16TH JYAISHTA 1929

WP(C).No. 17270 of 2007(E)

PETITIONER:

UNNIKRISHNAN K.V.,
LOWER DIVISION CLERK, OFFICE OF THE
SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE, THRISSUR.

BY ADV. SRI.C.HARIKUMAR
SRI.VIZZY GEORGE KOKKAT
SRI.ARAVINDA KUMAR BABU T.K.

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. **PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,**
   DEPARTMENT OF LAW, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. **PRINCIPAL SECRETARY,**
   HOME DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. **DIRECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,**
   POLICE HEAD QUARTERS, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

4. **SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,**
   OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE,
   THRISSUR.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI.BIJOY CHANDRAN

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 06/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR, J.

W.P.(C) No. 17270 of 2007-E

Dated this the 6th day of June, 2007.

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is a Lower Division Clerk working in the office of the Superintendent of Police, Thrissur. The Government invited applications for appointment to the post of Legal Assistant Grade-II in the Law Department, as per Ext.P2 notification dated 20-12-2006. The method of appointment was by transfer from the persons working in other departments. The petitioner was eligible to apply for the said post. He submits, he came to know about the notification recently. So this writ petition is filed, praying that his application may be received notwithstanding the cut off date contained in Ext.P2 notification for receiving the applications.

2. The contention of the petitioner is that Ext.P2 was not circulated in the office of the 4th respondent where he was working. On the basis of such a ground, the last date of receipt of applications to a post cannot be extended. If the same is permitted, every candidate will come forward saying that the notification did not reach his office and therefore he should be allowed to apply when he came to know about it. Of course, such action cannot be permitted. So,

the prayer of the petitioner cannot be granted. Accordingly, the writ petition fails, and it is dismissed.

K.BALAKRISHNAN NAIR,
JUDGE.

MS